DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 298 FL 023 581

AUTHOR Hussein, Anwar A.
TITLE English as a Second Language Instructors: Preservice and Inservice Training.
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (29th, Long Beach, CA, March 26-April 1, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Education; *English (Second Language); Graduate Study; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Language Teachers; National Surveys; Preservice Teacher Education; *Relevance (Education); Second Language Instruction; Second Language Programs; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Qualifications

ABSTRACT

A 1993 national survey investigated the attitudes of current directors and coordinators of college and university English-as-a-Second-Language programs (n=100) concerning the effectiveness of graduate programs in training them for their professional and administrative responsibilities. Results indicate that graduates of these graduate programs were generally satisfied with their preparation for academic responsibilities, but few reported being offered managerial training. However, the respondents indicated relatively high effectiveness in administering their programs despite dissatisfaction with the managerial training they received in graduate programs. It is recommended that these programs incorporate a managerial training component, as an elective course from another department, in an internship, or through presentations and workshops. The survey instrument is appended. Contains 32 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 393 298

English as a Second Language Instructors: Preservice and Inservice Training

by Anwar A. Hussein

The present study is designed to provide competent answers to two main questions. These are: 1) What level of satisfaction do current graduate TESL programs' directors have with the graduate training of the programs from which they graduated? 2) What is the relationship between the current directors level of satisfaction and the perceived level of effectiveness of the master and doctoral TESL programs in preparing them for their duties? A questionnaire was mailed to all TESL program directors (n=143) in the United States. Exactly 100 questionnaires were returned constituting 69.9% of the population. Data analysis revealed that all the participants are satisfied with their academic training, but not with their managerial training. However, they reported that they were effective in directing their programs due to experience and other reasons. A high percentage (79%) of the participants indicated that it is very important, important or somewhat important to offer managerial training to TESOL graduates.

Introduction

This article describes the results of a national survey of the current directors and coordinators of TESL graduate programs at American universities. Data were collected via a questionnaire in February, 1993 mailed to 143 directors of such programs across the United States. Data collection terminated at the end of March with a total of 100 responses comprising 69.9% of the population surveyed.

This paper focuses on two main issues: the effectiveness of graduate TESL programs in preparing graduates for professional academic and administrative responsibilities and the satisfaction of these graduates with their training. First, the results pertaining to the effectiveness of the programs and the directors satisfaction with the preparation of these programs is documented. A discussion of the results is presented in the following section. Then, the article concludes with some recommendations for graduate TESL programs pertaining to their curricula.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Anwar A. Hussein

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL023581

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This study also examines the relationship between the graduates satisfaction and the perceived level of effectiveness of their programs in preparing them for their duties, and also reviews administrative problems that the current directors face pertaining to their programs.

Literature Review

The TESL literature is almost devoid of any study that focuses on the Master and Doctoral TESL programs academic and administrative preparation of their graduates. The present study is the first on a national level, which surveyed all the current directors of TESL graduate programs on the issues noted above. There are only two previous studies which investigated the adequacy of M. A. TESL programs in preparing their graduates for their prospective jobs. Ochsner (1980) surveyed 40 M.A. TESL programs of which only 14 (35%) were included in his study. Ochsner concluded that the M.A. programs provide their graduates with adequate training except publication and administration, and concluded that "... training in administration skills may represent an important omission in the training of M.A. in TESOL Candidates" (p. 206). Day (1984) surveyed the Master's degree graduates in TESL from the University of Hawaii and concluded that M.A. TESL programs should consider providing their graduates with administrative instruction.

There are also a limited number of studies that addressed related issues, for example Reasor (1981), Saltzer (1982), Mathies (1983), and Pennington (1985), studied the Intensive English Program (IEP) directors who are graduates of TESL and applied linguistics graduate programs. These studies focused only on the administrative aspects of IEP programs which offer ESL instruction to foreign students. These studies, particularly, Reasor (1981) and Mathies (1983) suggest that IEP program directors are in need for specialized administrative skills.

Methods of Data Analysis

Both types of data, qualitative and quantitative, were collected. The grounded theory method (Charmaz, 1983) was utilized in analyzing the qualitative data. The quantitative data were analyzed using the SAS statistical package. In particular, Chi Square was utilized to test the independence of the following nominal and categorical variables from each other:

A. Is the current directors' level of satisfaction independent of or dependent on their perceived, self-reported level of success of M.A. and doctoral TESL programs, pertaining to preparing them to academic and administrative responsibilities?

B. Is the perceived, self-reported effectiveness of the program administrator independent of or dependent on his/her previous managerial training?

C. Is the effectiveness of the program administrator independent of or dependent on the length of the time the respondent has served as an administrator?

D. Are the problems identified by the administrator independent of or dependent on his/her previous managerial training?

E. Are the problems identified by the administrator independent of or dependent on the length of time the respondent has served as an administrator?

Satisfaction with Graduate Training

Results

In order to investigate the relationship between the level of satisfaction current TESL program directors have with their graduate training, particularly administrative training, and their level of success in supervising their programs, the participants were asked to describe their satisfaction with the graduate training they received and their level of success in performing their responsibilities.

In describing the level of satisfaction with preparation for their administrative responsibilities (question number 15), as Table 1 shows, 8%, 30%, 28%, and 32% were very well prepared, fairly prepared, poorly prepared, or not at all prepared, respectively. On the other hand, their level of preparation for their academic responsibilities (question number 11) was 52% (very well prepared), 39% (fairly well prepared), 6% (poorly prepared) and 3% (not at all prepared).

Table 1

Satisfaction with Academic and Administrative Preparation

Preparation	Very Satisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Poorly Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied
Academic	52.0%	39.0%	6.0%	3.0%
Administrative	8.0%	30.0%	28.0%	32.0%

The percentages in Table 1 indicate that TESL graduate programs are perceived as doing very well in preparing their students to assume academic responsibilities but very poorly in preparation for administrative (nonacademic) responsibilities. Does this inadequate administrative preparation have an impact on the level of success of TESL graduate programs directors in the performance of their administrative responsibilities?

Level of Success in Performing Administrative Duties

In survey question 17, the participants were asked to describe their level of effectiveness or success in executing their administrative responsibilities. Surprisingly, even though in question 15, 60% of the participants reported that they were poorly or not at all prepared for administrative duties when they graduated from their programs, 42%, 45%, and 10% described their administrative performance as very effective, fairly effective, and somewhat effective, respectively. The reasons behind such effectiveness, as reported by the participants themselves in Part III, question 18, are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2
Reasons for Administrative Effectiveness*

Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective
1. Length or period as an administrator.	1. Being a new administrator with limited years of experience.	1. Moderately successful in garning faculty and resources.
2. Popularity of the program.	2. Having good interpersonal skills.	2. Budget problems.

Table 2, cont..

Very Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective
3. General viability and success of the program director training.	3. Believe in participative management theory.	3. Lack of cooperation with other disciplines.
4. Observing other effective administrators.	4. Lack of administrative training.	4. Not enough release time to be effective.
5. Well established administrative structure.	5. Large size of the program.	5. Overload.
6. Because of administrative training received.	6. Not enough support from the institution.	6. Poor politician.
7. Knowing the goals of the program.	7. Severely understaffed.	
8. Comments by internal and external observers.	8. Having few support services.	
9. Being able to operate with limited resources.		
10. Consistent record of success.		
11. Staff like their work situation.		
12. Growth of the program.		

*In question 17, no responses were given for the "ineffective" option.

As Table 2 shows, among the reasons behind being very effective are the length of time the director has served as an administrator, receiving managerial training through graduate studies, in-service training and observing effective successful administrators, adopting participative management theory, planning skills and setting goals for the program, and ability to operate within limited budgets. Lack of administrative training, having limited years of experience, large size of the program, lack of institution support, budget problems, lack of

coordination with other disciplines, and overload are among the reasons behind being effective or somewhat effective.

Do the results shown in Table 2 pertaining to being effective as an administrator mean that there is a relationship between the effectiveness of the administrator and (a) his or her previous administrative training (question 15), or (b) the number of years he/she has served as an administrator (question four) and size of the program (question three)? Does this also mean that there is a relationship between the categories of problems the director faces and (a) his/her previous administrative training, and (b) the number of years he/she has served as an administrator?

In order to determine whether or not there is a statistical independence between the level of satisfaction that the current directors have with their graduate training, pertaining to administrative preparation, and their level of effectiveness in performing their managerial responsibilities, the test of statistical independence (Chi Square) was calculated. The value of Chi-Square required for significance at the 0.05 level for these data (df=2) is 5.99. The obtained value of Chi-Square = 4.818 does not exceed the value required for significance. Clearly the directors level of effectiveness in executing administrative duties is independent of their level of satisfaction.

In contrast, statistical analysis discloses that there is not statistical independence between the effectiveness of the program administrator and his/her previous managerial training. The obtained value of Chi-Square = 10.741 exceeds the value required for significance at the .05 level (5.99). Apparently, the level of effectiveness of the program administrator is not independent of the previous administrative training the director received. Table 3 shows the frequencies and percentages of the perceived, self-reported effectiveness of TESL program administrators.

Table 3

Effectiveness of TESL Programs Directors

Level of Effectiveness	N	Percentage
Very Effective	42	42.0
Effective	45	45.0
Somewhat Effective	9	9.0
Did Not Specify	4	4.0

N= 100

As Table 3 shows, 42% and 45% of the current directors describe themselves as very effective and effective, respectively. Part of this effectiveness comes from the previous managerial training those directors received outside of their graduate programs such as enrolling in management and leadership courses, in-service training, practice and experience, or getting help from a colleague. Table 4 illustrates the source of managerial training the current directors received before they embarked on supervising TESL programs and while they are administering such programs.

Table 4
Sources of Administrative Training

Source	N	Percentage
1. Through the graduate program	23	23.0
2. Enrolling in management courses later	05	5.0
3. In-service training	24	24.0
4. Practice and experience	91	91.0
5. Asking for help from a colleague	69	69.0

As is shown in the table above, practice and experience and asking for help from a colleague constitute the main source for administrative skills training utilized for managing TESL programs. Does this suggest that the effectiveness or success of the program director depends on his/her experience as a program administrator? Statistical analysis does provide a positive answer to this question.

The type of relationship between the effectiveness or success of the program administrator and the length of time he/she served as an administrator was tested by Chi-Square; the obtained value of Chi-Square = 10.741 exceeds the required value for significance at .05 (5.99) levels for df=2. Thus, the effectiveness of the program director is not independent of the time he/she served as an administrator for an TESL program. Table 5 shows the period of time such administrators served in administering their programs.

Table 5

Length of Time as an Administrator

Period	N	Percentage
1. 0-2 years	18	18.0
2. 3-5 years	29	29.0
3. 6-10 years	19	19.0
4. 11 years or longer	34	34.0

N= 100

Discussion

Analysis of these survey data showed that inadequate administrative preparation for managerial responsibilities will lead to dissatisfaction with the graduate training offered by TESL programs. Sixty percent of the current directors are poorly or not at all prepared for their administrative positions. These graduates, as a result, rate the programs from which they graduated unfavorably in this regard. Conversely, one should expect them to have a high level of satisfaction with their academic preparation which was rated favorably for preparation. for their academic duties. However, TESL graduates should be satisfied not only with their academic preparation, but also with their administrative education. This dual satisfaction is unlikely to develop in the future unless the current program directors take the initiative and fill this breach in TESL programs.

The high effectiveness that the current directors reported in this study is due to acquiring their managerial skills outside the TESL programs, that is, through practice and experience,

in-service training, seeking help from colleagues, and enrolling in management courses after graduation. It would be preferable and more rewarding if the current directors could report their high satisfaction and rate of success for the administrative training that they received through their graduate training.

Good human relations, planning and organizational skills and flexibility, are some of the key factors for success in job performance. Problems dealing with higher level administration, the inability to secure sufficient physical and human resources for the program, and poor decisions in hiring faculty are among the reasons behind ineffectiveness and failure on the job (Pennington, 1993). Since the level of success in administering a program depends on the level of satisfaction one has with his/her administrative training, it is desirable to offer appropriate instruction either through the same program or through other programs on campus. This high correlation between level of satisfaction and level of success also indicates the significance of developing such courses as reported by participants in Table 6 .

Table 6

Significance of Including Administrative Training in Graduate TESOL Programs

Importance	N	Percentage
Very Important	17	17
Important	25	25
Somewhat Important	37	37
Not Important	21	21

N=100

The significance and necessity of offering management training to prospective TESL program directors is also expressed by the participants in Pennington's (1993) study. In an open-ended question "Do you have any advice to offer a future program administrator in your position" (Pennington, 1993, p. 37), the participants provided some advice related to learning practical management skills, including (1) training as a teacher/scholar/linguist is not enough for

supervising a program, (2) trying an assistant director position before becoming a full-time director, (3) learning budget request, development and allocation, (4) taking a management seminar in conflict resolution and motivation, (5) getting special training in personnel management, and (6) taking management and accounting courses, are among the advice that the participants offered to those anticipating jobs in the TESL field. In addition, the participants advised prospective directors to foster a cooperative management style in directing their programs.

A relationship also exists between the preparation for administrative duties and the effectiveness of program administrators in their administrative styles. This indicates the importance of designing management courses in the programs which did not offer such training. This does not discount the exceptional personal characteristics which may aid many successful administrators in being more effective than other directors who lack such characteristics. In brief, providing management training through one's program or other programs, positively impacts the overall effectiveness of administrators.

The results of the present study provide an appropriate answer to Reasor's (1986) concern about "why 62% of the administrators ... perceived themselves to be ineffective ...". The answer that this study provides is that those administrators who have not received any kind of management training rated themselves as not effective in executing their administrative duties; and those who reported that they were very effective or effective in performing their duties, did so due to previous managerial training or training acquired on the job.

Another question which was also raised by both Reasor's study (1986), and the present study, is whether TESL administrators received appropriate administrative training. The results of the present study revealed that 60% of the current directors are poorly or not at all prepared for the jobs which they are doing. They were trained as teachers and scholars, rather than as administrators.

The effectiveness of the current program administrators has a relationship, even if it is not very strong, with the length of time he/she served as an administrator. This indicates that practice and experience is one of the most frequently utilized avenues through which

administrators acquire their administrative skills. More accurately, it is the only source of information for most of the administrators who have not received any kind of management training. This becomes more clear if we know that 91% of the participants reported that practice and experience was one of the main sources of administrative skills acquired through supervising their programs regardless of their places in the organizational structure of institutions.

Summary and Conclusion

The present study revealed that TESL graduate programs graduates are generally satisfied with their preparation for academic responsibilities, but very few of them reported that they were offered managerial training. However, the subjects indicated relatively high effectiveness in administering their programs even though they are not satisfied with the managerial training they received in the TESL programs from which they graduated. (see Table 2 for complete list of the reasons for their effectiveness). Such results call upon current TESL graduate programs to evaluate their curricula and to strongly consider some kind of management training in their programs. Such training might be offered as an elective course taken from other departments in the institution, an internship with experienced directors or through attending presentations and workshops at professional conferences such as TESOL's annual convention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Charmaz, K. (1983). The grounded theory method: An explication and interpretation. In M. Smith (Ed.), Introduction to qualitative research (pp. 17-34). Arizona: Kinkos Professor Publishing.

Day, R.R. (1984). Career aspects of graduate training in ESL. *TESOL Quarterly,*18(1), 109-123.

Ferguson, G. A., and Yoshio Takane. (1989). Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Mathies, B. F. (1983). *A study of the characteristics, qualifications, and perceived roles of the directors of intensive ESL programs.* Unpublished Disst. University of Illinois, Urban.

Mathies, B. F. (1984). The intensive English program directors' job skills. *The American Language Journal,* 2, 5-16.

Ochsner, R. (1980). Job-related aspects of the M. A. in TESOL degree. *TESOL Quarterly,* 14(2), 199-207.

Pennington, M. C. (1993). Advice from the front lines: What every ESL program director needs to know that they didn't teach you in graduate school. *Perspectives*, 5(1), 31-41.

Reasor, A. W. (1981). *Administrative styles of English-as-a-second language administrators.* Unpublished Disst. The American University.

Reasor, A. W. (1986). Dominant administrative styles of ESL administrators. *TESOL Quarterly,* 20(2), 338-342.

Richards, J. C., & Nobuyuki H. (1983). Training ESOL teachers: The need for needs assessment. In Alatis, E. J., H. H. Stern, P. Strevens (Eds.), *Georgetown university round table on languages and linguistics* (pp. 312-326). Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Staczek, J. J. (1991). Professional development and program administration. *TESOL Journal,* 2, 21-22, 27-28.

Wilcox, G. K. (1980). *Suggested guidelines for the selection and/or preparation of ESOL program administrators.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the TESOL organization, San Francisco, California.

Wright, S. M. (1981, Nov.). What makes a program manager successful. *WATES Newsletter*, 5-7.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT OF STUDY

Study of English As A Second Language/ University Program Administrator

Name (optional):_____

Institution (optional):_____

Please choose the most appropriate answer:

Part I. Background Information:

Note: The following questions pertain to the ESL program you are now administering.

1. What is the place of your ESL\Applied Linguistics program in the organizational structure of the university?

A. has its own department
B. within an English department
C. within a modern language department
D. other [specify]_____

2. What is your job title?

A. Division Chair
B. Coordinator\Director
C. Instructor with administrative duties
D. Other [specify]_____

3. What is the number of full-time faculty members in your department?

A. 1-5 members
B. 6-15 members
C. 15 members or larger

4. How long have you been an administrator?

A. 0-2 years
B. 3-5 years
C. 6-10 years
D. 11 years or longer

5. How do you describe yourself?

A. an administrator
B. primarily an administrator with instructional duties
C. an instructor
D. primarily an instructor with administrative duties

6. In addition to instruction and/or administration, what are your primary duties? (please rank any of the following duties in order of importance)

[ ] A. advising students
[ ] B. materials preparation
[ ] C. curriculum design
[ ] D. other [specify]_____
[ ] E. none of the above

7. Your current program:

A. does not provide its students with management and leadership courses
B. provides its students with management and leadership courses
C. in the process of designing such courses

8. If your program provides its students with management and leadership courses, it:

A. requires its students to take such courses from their program
B. requires its students to take such courses from other disciplines
C. encourages its student to take such courses from other disciplines
D. discourages its students to take such courses

Part II. Your Academic Training:
Note: Questions #9-15 refer to your own graduate program, i.e. the last program (master's or doctoral) from which you graduated.

9. What is your highest earned degree?

A. a doctoral degree
B. a master's degree
C. a bachelor's degree
D. other [specify]_____

10. How well were you prepared for the following responsibilities?

Responsibility	Very well prepared	Fairly well prepared	Poorly prepared	Not at all prepared
A. Teaching	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Research	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Publication	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. Critical Thinking	_____	_____	_____	_____

11. Overall, how well did your program prepare you for academic responsibilities?

A. very well
B. fairly well
C. poorly
D. not at all

Part III. Administrative Training:

12. How well were you prepared for the following duties?

Duty	Very well prepared	Fairly well prepared	Poorly prepared	Not at all prepared
A. Curriculum design	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Developing a budget	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Evaluating an ESL Program and its staff	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. Recruiting and retaining staff and students	_____	_____	_____	_____
E. Planning and setting goals for an ESL program	_____	_____	_____	_____

13. The program you graduated from:

A. did not offer any kind of management and leadership courses
B. offered management and leadership courses in its curriculum
C. required management and leadership courses through other programs
D. encouraged taking such courses through other programs
E. discouraged taking such courses

14. If the program you graduated from did not provide you with management skills, you learned them by:

A. enrolling in management courses later Yes __ No __
B. in-service training Yes __ No __
C. practice and experience Yes __ No __
D. asking for help from a colleague Yes __ No __

15. Overall, how well did your program prepare you for administrative duties?

A. very well
B. fairly well
C. poorly
D. not at all

16. How important is it for ESL\applied linguistics programs to include leadership and management courses?

A. very important
B. important
C. somewhat important
D. not important

17. Overall, as a program administrator how do you perceive yourself?

A. very effective
B. effective
C. somewhat effective
D. ineffective

18. In question #17 you rated yourself as A, B, C, or D because:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Part IV Comments:

19. What are the problems you face as an ESL or applied linguistics program director pertaining to the administrative aspects of your program?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

20. Please identify elements such as new courses and internships that might be included in ESL master and doctoral programs to improve preparation for administrative responsibilities?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

21. What are significant issues pertaining to the organizational placement of ESL programs in the academic structure in your institution (or of institutions)?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

22. Please comment on any question or other relevant point that you think is significant for ESL\Applied Linguistics programs administration.

Thank-you for your participation!

If you would like to be notified of the results of this study, please fill out the request slip below. You may mail the slip separately or with the survey (it will be detached from the questionnaire before it is read in order to preserve your anonymity).

Your help and cooperation are appreciated!

Please mail the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:

Anwar A. Hussein
Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85287-2411

Request slip

.....

Please send me an executive summary of the results of the *English as a Second Language Program Administration* study in which I have participated.

Name:
Address: